

REMARKS

Claims 17-32 were pending in the application and claims 17-32 were rejected. Claims 17, 18, 25, 26 and 30 were amended herein. Claims 19 and 29 were cancelled herein. The applicants request reconsideration of all rejected claims.

I. Rejection of Claims 17 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Higashi (U.S. 6,014,322).

CLAIM 17

Claim 17, as amended herein, reads as follows:

A bulk power supply system comprising:
a first bulk power supply;
a second bulk power supply;
a line filter that receives AC input power from a power distribution control assembly, **wherein said line filter suppresses harmonic signals from reflecting back into an AC input line;**
at least one isolation diode for hot swapping between said first bulk power supply and said second bulk power supply without disabling the first or second bulk power supply; and
an output receiver that receives output from said diode.

Claim 17 has been amended to include elements of claim 19, which has been cancelled herein. More specifically, claim 17 now includes a line filter that “suppresses harmonic signals from reflecting back into an AC input line.”

According to section 8 of the office action, Gegner (U.S. 5,404,092) discloses suppressing harmonic signals (501) from reflecting back to the AC lines at column 8, lines 6-7. The applicants note that element 501 is a filter that prevents electromagnetic interference from entering the power supply as shown in Fig. 5. Element 501 is only described as a filter at column 8, lines 3-7 of Gegner, which states the following:

Finally, it is noted that although the Power Factor Correction technique presented refers to FIG. 5 as an AC-to-DC converter, this is only one possible implementation where an AC input has been filtered by an EMI filter (501) and rectified by a rectifier bridge (502)

Thus, Gegner discloses filtering EMI by way of the filter 501. There is no disclosure in Gegner related to filter 501 being used to “suppresses harmonic signals from reflecting back into an AC input line” as claimed in claim 17.

With regard to column 8, lines 6-7 of Gegner cited by the office action, this section refers to Fig. 11 and relates to DC to DC conversion. Accordingly, there are no AC lines in which harmonic signals may reflect. Accordingly, this cited section of Gegner has no bearing on the line filter of claim 17, previously claim 19.

Based on the foregoing, none of the references disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 17. Therefore, the applicants contend that the rejection has been overcome.

CLAIM 20

Claim 20 is dependent on claim 17 and is deemed allowable by way of its dependence, and for other reasons.

II. Rejection of Claim 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson (U.S. 6,278,624).

CLAIM 28

A method of providing a supply power output for a user system comprising:
receiving a first AC input from a first AC input line and **suppressing harmonic signals from reflecting back to the first AC input line**;
receiving a second AC input from a second AC input line;
converting said first AC input and said second AC input into DC power;
adjusting said DC power to ensure that said DC power has at least a predetermined value for a power factor;
sending said adjusted DC power to at least two converters, wherein said at least two converters are designated to receive DC power of differing voltage levels;
transmitting outputs of said at least two converters to at least one isolation diode and to an output filter; and
receiving an output from said output filter.

Claim 28 has been amended to include some of the elements of claim 29, which has been cancelled herein. More specifically, claim 28 now includes suppressing harmonic signals from reflecting back to the first AC input line. According to section 12 of the office action, Gegner discloses suppressing the harmonic signals as originally set forth in claim 29. However, as stated above, Gegner discloses suppressing EMI from entering a power supply. There is no disclosure related to suppressing signals from reflecting back to an AC line as claimed.

Based on the foregoing, neither Nelson, Gegner, nor their combination, disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 28. Therefore, the rejection of claim 28 has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

III. Rejection of Claims 18, 19, 24, 26, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 18, 19, 24, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Higashi in view of Gegner (U.S. 5,404,092). The applicants note that claim 19 has been cancelled herein.

CLAIMS 18, 19, AND 24

Claims 18, 19, and 24 are dependent on allowable base claims and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 26

Claim 26 is independent and reads as follows:

A bulk power supply system comprising:

a first converter chain comprising a first line filter, a first rectifier, a first power factor correction, and a first converter, **wherein said first line filter suppresses harmonic signals from reflecting back into AC input lines;**

a second converter chain comprising a second line filter, a second rectifier, a second power factor correction, and a second converter;

at least one isolation diode, wherein said at least one isolation diode switches between said first converter chain and said second converter chain upon failure of one of said converter chains; and

whereby a failure of one converter chain will permit the remaining converter chain to satisfy the load for said bulk power supply system.

Claim 26 has been amended to include the elements of claim 19. More specifically, claim 26 now includes wherein the first line filter suppresses harmonic signals from reflecting back into an AC input line. As stated above, these elements are not disclosed by either Higashi or Gegner. Accordingly, the references cannot render claim 26 obvious. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIM 27

Claim 27 is dependent on claim 26 and is deemed allowable by way of its dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

IV. Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Higashi in view of Brown (U.S. 5,481,730).

Claim 21 is dependent on claim 17 and is deemed allowable by way of its dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

V. Rejection of Claims 22 and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Higashi in view of Brown (U.S. 5,481,730), and further in view of Li (U.S. 6,700,767).

Claims 22 and 23 are dependent on allowable base claims and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

VI. Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Higashi in view of Kociecki (U.S. 6,198,642).

Claim 25 is dependent on claim 17 and is deemed allowable by way of its dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

VII. Rejection of Claims 29 and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Gegner. Claims 29 has been cancelled herein.

Robert Nelson, attorney for the applicants, states, per MPEP 706.02(I)(2)(II), that at the time of the present invention, it was under an obligation to be assigned to Hewlett-Packard, which Nelson has also been assigned to. Thus, per 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Nelson and the present application were under an obligation of assignment to the same entity. Therefore, Nelson cannot be used as a 35 U.S.C. §103(a) reference.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

VIII. Rejection of Claim 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Cabaniss (U.S. 5,790,394).

As stated above, Nelson is not a proper reference for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, this rejection has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration.

IX. Rejection of Claim 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Brown.

As stated above, Nelson is not a proper reference for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, this rejection has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By: /Robert W. Nelson/
Robert W. Nelson
Reg. No. 37,898
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: (303) 298-9888
Fax: (303) 297-2266